DEMOCRATIC
GERMAN REPORT

VOL. VI NO. 11 May 24th 1957 Price: 15 Pf., 5c., 3d

PARLIAMENTS APPEAL ON BOMB

The Parliaments of Czechoslovakia, Poland and the German Democratic Republic have appealed to all European parliaments to oppose the stationing of atomic weapons in West Germany, and the equipment of the West German Wehrmacht with atomic weapons.

The appeal was made at the end of a three-day conference in Berlin between representatives of the parliaments of the three countries. The joint declaration concluding the conference was signed in Potsdam on May 11th in the hall where the historic Potsdam Conference of 1945 had been held.

The delegations to the conference were headed by Czeslaw Wycech, Marshal of the Polish Sejm; Zdenek Fierlinger, Chairman of the National Assembly of Czechoslovakia; and Dr Johannes Dieckmann, Chairman of the People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic.

Main points in the joint statement were:

1. The representatives of the three parliaments appeal to all European nations, parliaments and governments to oppose the A-bomb policy in West Germany.

2. The existing frontiers of Poland and Czechoslovakia are final and inviolable. The security and inviolability of the German Democratic Republic is an essential condition for the preservation of peace.

3. The Warsaw Treaty (the East European defence pact) is a necessary guarantee for peace, and everything must be done to increase the defensive power of the Warsaw Treaty powers.

4. The parliaments of the three countries are united in their views on the main international problems, and will increase their cooperation in building socialism.

(The text of the joint communique is given on the next page)

Adenauer Clings to A-Bomb

West German Chancellor Adenauer, who is an enthusiastic gardener, tends his atomicarnations.
(from "Deutsche Woche", Munich, West Germany)

West German Chancellor Adenauer mobilised all his parliamentary supporters on May 10th to defeat a Social Democratic motion calling on his government to renounce the atom bomb.

The opposition motion was defeated by 228 votes to 113. The motion had called upon the government to desist from arming the new West German Wehrmacht with atomic weapons, and to refuse other powers the right to station atomic weapons in West Germany. American atomic-cannon have been stationed in West Germany for the past year.

Social Democrat Fritz Erler, who spent six years in a nazi jail, supporting the motion, said: "We must concentrate all our energies on a relaxation of tension, and on making possible all-round disarmament, together with the reunification of our country. These aims cannot be reconciled with a drive for atomic weapons, and participation in competition in the field of atomic armaments. The time-bomb of a partitioned Germany is dangerous enough by itself: it would become far more dangerous if it were equipped with an atomic warhead."

Main government spokesman was Defence Minister Franz-Josef Strauß, main supporter of atom bombs for the Wehrmacht. He claimed it was absolutely imperative that atom weapons should be kept in West Germany "in view of the Soviet threat", and in addition stated that no West German government would be able to prevail upon the Americans to withdraw their atom cannon from West German soil.

In place of the Social Democratic anti-A-bomb resolution, the West German Parliament passed a vaguely-worded government resolution urging America, Britain, and the United States to refrain from atomic tests "for a limited period".

Parliamentary Declaration – Text

The representatives of the parliaments of the three neighbouring socialist states express their satisfaction that at the present time there is a stronger tendency towards relaxation of international tension and cooperation of the peoples for the maintenance of peace. A decisive role in this development is played by the will to peace and the constructive peace policy of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic, the other socialist countries, India, and other states.

Certain imperialist forces, however, have no desire for a relaxation of tension, and are taking steps leading to a sharpening of the situation. They continually threaten the independence and liberty of the peoples, and have based their policy upon military armaments. It is these forces which have prevented an agreement upon the banning of A-bombs and H-bombs, and upon ending tests with these weapons. It is these forces which have encouraged the revival of German imperialism and militarism in the Federal Republic, which represent an extreme danger for the security of the German Democratic Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, and the Polish People's Republic, for all other European nations, and above all for the German people themselves.

The latest meeting of the NATO Council in Bonn decided in principle on the equipment of the NATO Pact partners with A and H weapons. An increasing number of atomic weapons of all types should be stationed in Western Europe, and atomic missiles of all calibers should be stored and atomic racket lauching ramps should be contructed there. This would convert West Germany into the main NATO atom base in Europe. The appointment of former Hitlerite generals to leading positions in NATO shows the content and the dangerous character of this policy.

The peoples of the whole world have been alarmed by announcements that so-called tactical atomic weapons should be included in the usual armament of modern armies, although it is known that such weapons have the same destructive power as the atom bombs which destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the closing stages of World War Two. The representatives of the parliaments of our three allied countries therefore welcome and support the voices which have warned against the danger of stationing atomic weapons in West Germany, and appeal to the peoples, parliaments and governments of all European nations to oppose decisively such a policy.

The conference partners condemn the revenge efforts in West Germany which are directed against the territorial integrity of the Polish People's Republic and its western frontier on the Oder and Neisse, against the territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Republic, against the security of the German Democratic Republic, and against the Soviet Union and other states. They strongly oppose all such propaganda.

The conference partners declare once again with all earnestness that the existing frontiers of the Polish People's Republic and the Czechoslovak Republic are final and inviolable. They declare with equal earnestness that the security and inviolability of the German Democratic Republic are an essential condition for the maintenance of peace in Europe. They regard the existence of the German Democratic Republic as a guarantee that in the solution of the German question the standpoint of the progressive forces of the German people will be put into effect in full force. The constructive proposals of the German Democratic Republic for German reunification, and its foreign policy, create favourable conditions for a solution of the German problem in accordance with the vital interests of all nations in Europe.

The conference partners oppose the barriers which have been erected in Europe, groupings which artifically divide the European continent, and treaties like Euratom and the so-called Common Market. If these plans are put into effect they will subject the economy of the states of West Europe to the rule of the West German monopolies, and deepen the fateful partitioning of Europe which runs counter to the vital interests of all European nations. Europe is after all inhabited by nations linked by the bonds of an old culture, by trade routes, and by common economic interests.

In view of the systematic strengthening of NATO, the equipment of the NATO armies with A-weapons, and other measures to partition Europe, the conference participants declare: The Warsaw Treaty is a necessary guarantee for the peaceful life of their peoples, and everything must be done to strengthen the defensive force of the Warsaw Pact Organisation.

The conference participants declare that their identy of views on basic problems of the international situation springs from community of ideals and aims, and from membership of their countries in the great family of socialist nations, among whom nobody will succeed in sowing the seeds of discord.

The Parliaments of the German Democratic Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic and the Polish People's Republic will devote all their efforts to further strengthening the unity of the socialist countries, and to further developing their mutual cooperation.

This unity and strength is not only a guarantee for the security of the socialist countries, but also a decisive factor in the maintenance of peace.

The nations represented here will continue to contribute to the solution of the most important international problems in a spirit of peace and cooperation with all states regarless of their system.

The conference participants express the conviction that the most urgent problems today are disarmament, the banning of A and H weapons, and as a first step to this end the ending of tests with these weapons. The future of mankind depends on the solution of these problems. For this reason they support unreservedly the Soviet proposals in the Disarmament Sub-Committee of the United Nations.

The socialist states, by considerably reducing their armed forces, have shown their readiness to contribute to international disarmament. It is high time that other countries follow this example.

The conference participants support the creation of an effective system of collective security in Europe. This would make easier a solution of basic problems in Europe, in particular the problem of German reunification. In particular they give their support to all partial steps to this end, such as the proposal for an ban on the stationing of atomic weapons in West Germany: such a ban would be of the greatest importance for security and peace in Europe.

The vital interests of the European nations demand all-European cooperation in the fields of economy, culture and the peaceful utilisation of atomic energy. The parliaments of the European states have an important part to play in solving all such questions.

The conference participants express the hope that the representatives of the parliaments of the other European states will make their voices heard in order to liberate mankind from the fear of atomic death, and to guarantee peaceful development and security for the European peoples.

ADENAUER MEETS MACMILLAN

They Agree — Then Differ

British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan reached "full agreement" with West German Chancellor Adenauer on a number of points, including the strengthening of the West German Wehrmacht, at talks held in Bonn in the second week of May.

West German government spokesmen, immediately after the talks had ended, claimed that Adenauer had prevailed upon the British Prime Minister to abandon the "Second Eden Plan" originally proposed at the Geneva Conference in July 1955, which foresaw a controlled zone of limited armaments in central Europe, including both halves of Germany. These spokesmen were thrown into confusion on May 9th when Prime Minister Macmillan told a press conference in Bonn that the second Eden Plan had not been abandoned, but was still on the agenda for discussion. A summary of the two "Eden Plans" is given below.

Mr Macmillan was the first British Prime Minister to pay a visit to the West German Federal Republic. The last peace time visit of a British Prime Minister to Germany was in September 1938, when Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain made his ill-famed "appeasement" visits to Hitler which resulted in the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, and led directly to the outbreak of the Second World War.

The official communique issued after the Adenauer-Macmillan talks made the following main points:

1. Both sides support efforts for disarmament, but until "the Soviet block is ready to conclude the necessary all-in agreement" it is necessary to strengthen further the existing defence organisations.

2. Both sides agree that NATO must be provided with effective means, including a strong shield of land, sea and air forces, for deterring an aggressor. West German Defence Minister Strauss will shortly visit London for joint defence talks.

3. The British Government welcomes the treaties on the Common Market and Euratom. Steps should be taken to simplify the present variety of existing and planned European organisations.

4. The British Government states once again that the reunification of Germany is one of its main political aims. Both Governments are convinced that no genuine security can be attained in Europe as long as Germany is partitioned.

•

The two "Eden Plans", given in outline below, played a large part in the discussions in Bonn. The first Eden Plan, which would impose German reunification without consulting the two existing German governments, has been decisively rejected in the past both by the Government of the German Democratic Republic and by the Soviet Union. The second Eden Plan, which would lead to a relaxation of tension in central Europe by the creation of a zone of limited armaments, has been welcomed in principle by the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union, and guardedly supported by President Eisenhower, but flatly turned down by the Government of the West German Federal Republic.

The Two Eden Plans

Here are the main points of the two Eden plans:

Eden Plan No. 1, proposed on January 29th 1954 by British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden at the Four Power Berlin Conference:

1. General elections should be held throughout Germany under four power supervision, possibly with neutral participation. The electoral law should be drafted by the four powers without German participation.

2. The National Assembly thus elected should draft constitution: during this intervening period the Four Power supervisory commission should remain in operation.

3. An All-German Government would be formed, assuming the international rights and obligations of the existing East and West German Governments. This Government would be responsible for concluding a peace treaty.

Eden Plan No. 2, proposed by British Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden at the Geneva Summit Conference on July 18th/19th and 21st 1955:

1. Top level agreement on a limitation of the total of forces and armaments on each side in Germany and the countries neighbouring on Germany.

2. A system of reciprocal control to exercise effective supervision of this agreement.

3. Agreement on "a specified area of fixed depth on either side of the line now dividing Eastern and Western Europe in which there should be supervision by inspection teams appointed by the military commanders on either side". This experiment, if successful, might be "extended outwards from the centre to the periphery".

Half W. Germans Nix Bomb

More than fifty percent of West Germans oppose the equipment of the West German Wehrmacht with atomic weapons, according to a public opinion poll conducted last week by the "Intermarket" research organisation in Dusseldorf. Only 33 % of the sample questioned were in favour of atom bombs for the Wehrmacht, and 51 % opposed. 56 % of those questioned believed that such armament would increase the dangers for Germany; 46 % believed that Chancellor Adenauer had no legal right to impose atomic armaments upon West Germany.

An overwhelming majority of all those questioned — 88 % — would welcome an international agreement banning atomic weapons, and almost nobody declared himself opposed to such an agreement.

Please Note . . .

that because of staff holiday arrangements this issue of GERMAN REPORT had to appear a few days early, and cannot therefore bring the latest news. Next issue of the paper is due for publication on June 21st.

NO TENSION — PEOPLE RELAXED

— *Welsh M.P.s., Clergymen*

Five Welsh Labour M.P.s. and three ministers from Wales who visited the German Democratic Republic early in May stated that they were much impressed by the determination with which the people of the Republic were tackling the task of building socialism. They had found no evidence of any state of tension, they stated.

The visiting group consisted of Stanley Awbery, M.P. for Bristol Central; James Idwal Jones, M.P. for Wrexham; Alderman Percy Morris, M.P. for Swansea West; Iorwerth Rhys Thomas, M.P. for Rhondda West; Rev. Llywelyn Williams, M.P. for Abertillery, Rev. Thomas James Davies, Rev. W. Phillips John and Rev. Cyril Glyndwr Williams.

Here is the full text of their statement:

The Delegation composed of five Members of Parliament and three Ministers of Religion wish to thank Dr. Dieckmann (Chairman of Parliament) for the invitation to study political, economic, social und religious conditions in the German Democratic Republic.

We wish to state at the very outset that we could not have received greater kindness or more consideration.

We saw everything we wished to see without let or hindrance. Not on a single occasion did we feel that we were only allowed to see what the authorities wished us to see.

The programme was at all times subject to any changes that we wished to make. Even politicians and ministers of religion are the victims of propaganda, so all expected to see evidence of a state of tension existing in the minds and attitudes of the ordinary people — particularly in the relationship of the people towards the Russian soldiers and towards the People's Police and the People's Army.

We wish to place on record that during all our travels we saw no evidence whatsoever of a state of tension. The people as far as we could judge, and we spoke freely to all sorts and ranks of people in all sorts of places, were as relaxed as the people in Great Britain. We feel that it is our duty to inform our own countrymen of this because sufficient harm has been done already by false propaganda.

The feelings of the people towards the British were genuinely cordial. They deeply regret the restrictions placed on people from the German Democratic Republic who wish to visit Britain, and also, of course, the trade embargo which denies the Republic the opportunities for greater trade with Britain.

We shall use whatever influence we have to ease this position. The devastation to Berlin and Dresden is beyond description and we are filled with admiration for the reconstruction which already has taken place. It is obvious that life will, economically, be difficult for some time to come but we have faith that the people are bound together by the determination to establish a real Socialist state.

Materially, of course, the ordinary people are obviously worse off than the people of Britain — their clothes and the price of many commodities soon reveal that — but nevertheless they have those qualities of character and their genuine love for cultural activities and their common struggle for Socialism to give them a great purpose in living.

The ministers in the deputation who were given all the opportunities and contacts they desired to find out things for themselves, are of the opinion that there is no religions persecution here. There is, they suggest, a struggle between the state and the church for the adherence and enthusiasm of youth. The clash between the church confirmation and the secular Dedication Services presents difficulties. It is too early yet to prophesy how this will finally be resolved. But the fact that many leading political figures in the Democratic Republic are avowed Christians suggests that religion has a tremendous influence in the life of many people. The large church attendances in some places suggest the same thing.

We were very moved and impressed by the tremendous May Day Demonstration at Dresden. The solidarity of the people of all sections appealed to us. The gaiety and enthusiasm of the people were genuine and spontaneous.

We paid a special visit to the Sorb District and were very interested in the generous way in which the state supports the cultural aspirations and the nationalistic spirit of the Sorb people. As Welshmen we were particularly glad to note this.

We have perceived in all directions a passionate desire for the reunification of Germany. All the nations concerned will need to make compromises before this can be brought about. But undoubtedly the over-riding passion of the people is for a durable peace. Finally we wish to testify that from every possible standpoint the visit has been thoroughly justified. Many suspicions have been removed from our minds. We have acquired new and helpful information. And we shall do everything in our power to bring the peoples of our respective countries closer and closer together in the bonds of peace and social progress.

Hitler's Bankers Merge

West Germany's big banks, which financed Hitler's war effort, will be "virtually reunified" before the end of May, Associated Press reported from Frankfurt on May 8th. The Associated Press report stated: "West Germany's big three in banking, split up under the Allied decartellisation program after the war, will be virtually reunified before the end of the month. Recentralisation of the Dresdner, Deutsche, and Commerz banks runs parallel to the remerger of the country's big industrial combines split up under the Allies' post-war 'Operation Trust-Bust'."

The role of the big bank in Hitler's war was exposed on December 1st 1945 by Dwight D. Eisenhower, today President of the US, but then American Military Governor in Germany. Eisenhower stated in a report on that date:

"These big banks formed between them a great combine which financed a major part of the German war effort; they were guilty of complicity in such war crimes as the exploitation of slave labour, the imposition of excessive occupation costs, and the looting of property in occupied countries; through interlocking directorates they controlled or had a predominant interest in over 200 major industrial undertakings."

BRECHT'S WORKSHOP

By Erwin Strittmatter

The author of this article, Erwin Strittmatter, started out in life as an agricultural labourer. After the war he began to write, and his play "Katzgraben" came to the attention of dramatist Bertolt Brecht, with whom Strittmatter later worked closely. His novel "Tinko", published in 1954, is regarded by many critics as the best post-war German novel.

The door opens with an electric buzz and no-one has come yet. It is dark on Brecht's floor. I wait in the hall. An old clock ticks. A tree with fat buds brushes against the window. It stands with two or three others on a small, cloister-like lawn which shares for a few paces the six-foot wall of a cemetery. Brecht liked this meagre garden and the old trees in the cemetery. Otherwise there was "too much nature" everywhere for him. There was no thought of dying when he said that to me. Now he lies in the cemetery beyond that wall.

I listen for a while to the clock in the hall. Is his clock still hanging in the room above? It was cased in a copper frying pan. It never worked. Sometimes, as we paced up and down over the light wood floor of his room, talking and laughing, showing each other the movements of people we had met — (we often conveyed our impressions quicker thus than in words) — he used to go up to this clock and start the pendulum swinging. The clock began to tick; but not for long before it stopped again. Once he hurried into the kitchen with his small steps, firmly determined to get this clock going again at last, fetched a splinter of wood and stuck it between the clock and the wall. He turned quickly, saw that I was watching him, felt himself "caught out" in a bit of manual work, turned shy and left the job unfinished. — "Hopeless!" — I expect he went back to his experiments with the piece of wood as soon as I had gone.

His dog comes into the hall; very tired and quiet. He stops, looks at me and does not even wag his tail when he recognises me. Does he feel... "Nonsense!" I can hear Brecht saying. "He's not enough with other dogs, that's all." I feel ashamed of my attack of sentimentality.

A good thing that Helene Weigel comes, weighted down with activity and very much of this world. Archivist Hans Bunge appears and talks of his plans for the archives. We eat, drink a "drop of something special" as we used to do, and laugh. This is no house of death. I had only come in during the little pause for fifteen minutes' sleep which Brecht used to snatch between supper and the evening's work.

We go up to Brecht's rooms. "Don't fall flat when you see how it looks upstairs now", says Helene Weigel. New cupboards have been built in on the landing. There is a smell of fresh wood. Archive cupboards.

Brecht's rooms really do not look very inviting. Piles of papers, folders, all sorts of strange office equipment, duplicating machines. There is a big black chest in front of the bedroom door. Its lid is thrown back and Helene Weigel bends down over it — just as she does in "Senora Carrar's Rifles" to take the guns out of a chest. Grey covers, packed back to back in the trunk, contain Brecht's manuscripts, amongst them plays and articles which we have neither seen nor read.

When Brecht emigrated in 1933 he had to leave his writings behind; it is thanks to Elisabeth Hauptmann, Brecht's faithful co-worker and editor of many of his books, that these were not found and burnt by the "paperhanger's men". She "moved in with the manuscripts", hid them and looked after them until they could be brought away.

The grey manuscript folders were brought to Sweden during the emigration period. When the Brechts had to go to Finland — ("changing countries more often than their shoes") — the folders had to be left behind at the last minute. A Swedish worker took the manuscripts to his home. He was no Communist, nevertheless with a sure instinct he faithfully guarded the "weapons of his class".

From Finland the grey folders travelled in trunks through the Soviet Union via Siberia to America. Trunks with clothes were left behind, but not those containing manuscripts. Ever and again Helene Weigel packed the folders and sent them on their way. Brecht was never there to do the packing. Like most men, he was not for packing; but he was also against leaving them behind or losing them. Sometimes, in the rush of departure, Helene Weigel could do no more than snatch up all the folders, manuscript sheets and notes and tie them up in big bundles. Thus she kept everything together and nothing was ever lost.

Now careful women's hands are sticking thick registration numbers on each manuscript page before they are photographed. "And those who are doing it must not be too great Brecht enthusiasts" says Hans Bunge, "otherwise they would never be able to stop reading and we should not get through sorting for years."

Can one even speak of manuscripts in Brecht's case? He generally wrote with the typewriter on thin grey paper. But the typed lines are often interspersed with small Gothic-script handwritten corrections — very close together, the sober handwriting of a clever tradesman. And there are masses of typed pages with strips of new typewritten corrected text pasted over them. Brecht even called himself a "master of pastology", and if one of us took up the scissors to help him out and paste, he used to say: "Leave that alone. You can't do it. You need years of study to do it properly."

Of course he knew that careful pasting of corrected text took more time than simply crossing out, but he liked handwork. When he was pasting and cutting he seemed to empty himself of thoughts, so that he could produce even more immediately afterwards.

There are letters too; longer letters written in Brecht's younger years and quite short ones, sometimes only a line, written later. There are diaries from 1938 up to Brecht's return to Germany, but these contain few purely personal remarks.

At first Hans Bunge, a photographer and Wolfgang Pinska worked alone on a special commission cataloguing Brecht's works. But one day the archivist took a foot-rule, measured the stacks of manuscript and came to the conclusion that, working like this, they would need eight years to read, register, photograph, sort and catalogue them. They would have to look round for suitable helpers.

"Aha" I hear Brecht saying, "the business with the foot-rule is worth

taking note of. Should we not weigh the stacks of manuscripts as well in future? Less than two hundredweights of writing experience — no writer. Away with him!"

Amongst Brecht's papers are not only manuscripts, diaries and letters, but also piles of newspaper cuttings. The "War Primer" (Kriegsfibel), as we know, grew out of newspaper pictures. Brecht worked extensively with photographs. Whenever he found photos which caught people in interesting postures he seized his scissors. He had scenes photographed during rehearsals, thus catching fleeting poses of actors, and fixed these or corrected them according to his own conception.

The well-known model books — which have sometimes been misunderstood by Brecht's colleagues in the theatre — grew up in this way, at the suggestion of Ruth Berlau, who had already photographed whole productions of Brecht plays during the emigration. Peter Palitzsch also helped with this work later.

One cannot speak of the Brecht archives without mentioning his faithful dramaturgical fellow-workers, Elisabeth Hauptmann, Kaethe Ruelicke, Isot Kilian, Peter Palitzsch, Manfred Weckwerth, Benno Besson, and Karl Weber amongst others, who prepared mountains of producer's directions, political and historical explanations, so-called notations. All this is a part of Brecht's work. I know of no other writer who worked so collectively as he...

These notations became even more valuable, however, when Bunge began to record them on tape about two years ago. It was now possible to hear them spoken, and this was important because of Brecht's broad scope of expression. There are now tape recordings of the rehearsals for "The Caucasian Chalk Circle", and there are over a hundred hours of recordings of "Galileo Galilei" spoken by Brecht.

The copying press now stands in the little kitchen, in front of the stove where we sometimes used to fry eggs. The first time I surprised Brecht practising his "kitchen art" he broke the shells into the frying pan with the eggs, left everything and asked me in an embarrassed voice if I knew how to fry eggs. Of course I fell for this one, fried the eggs and forgot to salt them. Meanwhile he set the table — as if he did not really know what to do next, although he knew perfectly well — all the time watching me out of the corner of his eye with that look that saw everything. "Fine, real fried eggs!" he said admiringly, "but it seems to me some people put salt on them."

His criticisms were always like that. He never rejected entirely anything he did not like. At rehearsals he first let his actors show how they thought they should interpret their parts. If what they "offered" did not fit in with his conception, he would say: "That's fine, but..." He never discouraged talented people. He corrected until they produced what he wanted.

The apparatus for photographing manuscript now stands in Brecht's front room, where his miniature harmonium used to stand. The harmonium wheezed more than it played. Once, in a cheerful mood, he demonstrated to me the nature of "misuc" on this instrument. The "theory of misuc" was his "discovery" and he teased his friends Eisler and Dessau with it.

I can see him going thoughtfully through the little duplicating factory which had been his apartment. "I seem to have made a mistake there. It's horrifying to see the muddle bursting out of drawers and boxes. I should have prevented it and gone on living." And I can see him standing behind one of the archivists and saying determinedly: "No, you are not to do that! I forbid you to look at what was written underneath before I pasted it over. That is an unproductive waste of time. That's just the reason why I pasted it over."

Each sheet of manuscript is photographed four times. The original manuscripts go to the Academy of Arts. This was Brecht's wish. When one thinks how some poets' writings are treated — how they are put up for auction by ignorant heirs, how they turn up as wrapping paper, how many notes and articles get lost — one is reassured to see how much expert care and knowledge, how much caution and care for the future are exercised in the Brecht archives.

And this is because Brecht lived in a modern state. Even the most deeply interested private concern could not provide the means for such extensive archive work. While he lived Brecht praised the generosity of his state in matters of art.

"You wouldn't get that anywhere else in the world", he said, speaking of the comfortable rehearsal stage provided for him. But he did not only praise. He criticised too, when he thought things were not being done properly in his state, when inexperienced or inartistic persons passed administrative measures connected with art.

But he always combined his criticisms with suggestions for improvement. He was constantly occupied with improvements, listening to experts and consulting them. Only a short time before his death he had a number of meetings to discuss how political propaganda work could be enlivened by small acting groups. His criticism was the criticism of a sensible worker who joins in thinking out ways to fulfil the plan more quickly.

I look in a folder containing thirty or forty cuttings from West German newspapers: reports on the Brecht archives which in their turn provide unusual archive material. A Hamburg journalist had a glimpse of the growing Brecht archives. He had stretched the few facts he had gleaned into a long article full of speculations and deliberate untruths. This report was reprinted in many West German papers. Untruths and slanders were emphasised in many editorial offices. Finally a completely conscienceless journalist not only wrote up the irresponsible report, but twisted and falsified it in his own way. The remaining West German papers now took up this plagiarist's report... How Brecht would have

Win a New Reader

Fill in the name and address of a friend, work-mate or acquaintance on the form below, and send it to

Democratic German Report
Friedrichstrasse 167/III
Berlin W 8, Germany

We shall be pleased to mail sample copies of the paper to him or her.

Name .....

Address .....

.....

laughed. "Strange how much one can learn about oneself" he said, when the "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung" published an article about him at the time of a PEN conference in Amsterdam.

It is certainly curious that just now certain newspaper people in West Germany are worrying as to whether we are dealing correctly with Brecht's writings, considering that they formerly allowed his plays to be boycotted in the Federal Republic without saying a word. As I read their reports copied from each other I recalled an evening in 1954:

We had come from France, had been driving all day and were tired. We wanted to stay the night in a little town near Bueckeburg. We had already carried our luggage up to our rooms in the hotel when we noticed that there was no bedside lamp in Brecht's room. (He used to read in bed.) We asked the waiter for a lamp, but the manager came at once and used our request as an excuse to turn us out. The "East" number-plate on our car had been discovered and they objected to the worker's cap Brecht was wearing.

We went into another hotel in search of an evening meal, but had already been "announced" there. They shoved us into an unfriendly club-room. They did not want to lose our modest payment, but on the other hand did not want to be compromised by "East Zone people". When we left the restaurant police were standing over the road. We went for a little walk, since we could hardly believe that they were there to watch us. The police walked with us. Brecht said then: "We sit at home and don't take things seriously enough. These people are really spreading themselves again here. It's like 1933."

About three years ago I returned from a trip abroad and gave Brecht my impressions of a poet's museum which I had visited. "That's hateful" he said. "The poet's clothes were exhibited in glass cases?" "Yes." His eyes flashed as he said: "I order you to see that after my death all my personal things, including my car, are sunk in the Schiffbauerdamm canal!"

He was half joking, half in earnest. We did not think of death at that time. I did not need to carry out his "order" after his death. There were people around him who knew how hurt he would have been by any kind of fetishism with his possessions.

So no Brecht Museum, but the Brecht Archives, have developed — this sounds like work, not museal. Brecht's apartment was photographed in detail after his death, and when the "copying factory" moves out his furniture and utensils will be put back in their old places.

Visitors will take up the photocopies of his manuscripts and perhaps sit down in his arm-chair, where Brecht never rested. People with whom he had worked or consulted were always leaving him when one came in, or fellow-workers came when one was on the point of leaving.

Research into art and the working class will go on in his apartment, and new knowledge will still be gathered there. This filled all his thoughts — in addition to the artistic application of his knowledge of course. But the like of him will not appear again so soon.

Amongst all these witnesses to his work here in the archives one does not have the impression that Brecht has really gone. He has just stepped a little to one side, as he used sometimes to do at rehearsals when he wanted to see how the performance looked from the "cheaper seats".

(From "Wochenpost", East Berlin)

BOOK CORNER

SS IN ACTION

"SS im Einsatz" (SS in Action). Kongress Verlag, Berlin. 12 marks (in German).

Another book about nazi war crimes? Yes, and a very necessary one today, when hundreds and hundreds of the old war criminals are creeping or hustling back into leading positions in West Germany. This book, a very sober and horrifying book, was compiled by the Committee of Anti-fascist Resistance Fighters of the German Democratic Republic. The book does not make any analysis, or launch any polemics: polemics and comments are not needed. It simply presents 600 pages of documents, most of them orders, letters and reports prepared by the men of the SS themselves. The other material in the book is also documentary: it consists of extracts from the court records of various war crimes trials, and statements made after their arrest by nazi war criminals.

Much of the material in the book will be familiar to readers who have studied the valuable books "The Final Solution" and "SS — Alibi of a Nation" by British author Gerald Reitlinger, but a considerable number of the documents, found after the war in SS files in all parts of Germany and other parts of Europe, have never appeared in book form before.

One of the most gruesome aspects of the SS organisation was the way in which frightful crimes were noted down in cold pseudo-scientific terms. There is, for instance, a letter sent to SS Colonel Eichmann in Berlin on June 21st 1942: "Subject: Assembling a collection of skeletons" which announces calmly that for this purpose a transport of 115 persons has been assembled in Auschwitz Concentration Camp, and is awaiting collection.

A frightful book, and a warning. It could happen again.

For Specialists Only

Poetry and Prose of the Anglo-Saxons, By Martin Lehnert. Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1955. Price 15.30 East German Marks. Accompanying Dictionary, Price 20 East German Marks.

This volume and the accompanying dictionary are of interest as showing the specialised works in English now being produced in the German Democratic Republic. The poetry and prose excerpts are given partly in the original Anglo-Saxon and partly in modern English translation. All critical apparatus and notes are in English.

Laut und Leben (Speech and Life) by Wilhelm Horn and Martin Lehnert. A history of English pronunciation from 1400—1950. In 2 Volumes. Published by Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1954. (In German).

In over 1400 pages the authors analyse, in German, and in minute detail, the development of the pronunciation of the English language. A book for specialists only.

BERLIN NOTEBOOK

By John Peet

An interesting unsigned article in the London "New Statesman and Nation" of April 6th dealt with the problem of the two Germanys which exist today; I did not agree by any means with some of the points made by the writer, but the article was an interesting attempt to be fair to both halves of Germany, and on one point at least it made me sit back and wonder whether GERMAN REPORT was always reaching a fair balance in reporting on the German scene. But more of that later. Here, first of all, are some extracts from this article:

"Germany . . . is getting set in her distortions . . . The hardening of an unnatural and unbalanced attitude does not imply stability. It means rather that the development of the community and of the individual will be permanently twisted. On the physical side there is the worst kind of duplication and division — division, for instance, of the state library and the national collections, duplication of the army and the police. On the personal side there is a curious tension and uncertainty that make it impossible to see the present as a settled state.

"The preaching of mutual hatred still goes on. The West Germans are taught . . . that any man associated with the Socialist Unity Party, however fine his record, is fit to be lynched; the climate is being prepared for a white terror, if not for a brown. Conversely, the easterner has no chance to learn of the anti-militarist temper among West Germans, or to grasp the many sane developments there and the still strong liberal feeling. Dr. Adenauer is presented, at best, as another Papen, and only the symptoms discreditable to his regime are mentioned in the controlled eastern press. Given the barriers to the free circulation of newpapers, and even of books, this means that each side of Germany only sees the worst of the other. East Germany appears as a wholly malevolent slave state, run with inhuman efficiency by a single-minded party machine; West Germany as a foreign financed country administered in the interests of the bankers and generals, rotten with ex-Nazis and new Nazi-type movements, exploiting and breaking its workers with the connivance of demoralised Social-democratic leaders. The rather less discouraging truth that lies between these pictures is not explored . . .

"The broad conditions of a stable settlement are not hard to see: the cutting down in both Germanys of home and foreign troops; the abolition of customs barriers and fixing of a true rate of exchange; a political reunification on terms that would guarantee the major social reforms in the east; the general acceptance of the present frontiers; a more constructive relationship between the two left-wing parties; the reduction and liberalisation of the People's Police . . . But no plan will be effective unless it is based on a more dispassionate estimate of the valuable elements in both halves of the country . . . German Communism, whatever its crimes and its failures in administering the Soviet-occupied zone, still has men and qualities of the sort that the country as a whole most needs.

"It is unfashionable to speak of this, just as it is unfashionable for easterners to mention the better aspects of the European movement or of Christian Democrat principles, or the German middle-class liberal tradition. But it is impossible to mix with Germans on both sides of the curtain without knowing that it is true . . ."

Now there are plenty of comments I could make on this article: I think that the writer is over-estimating the strength of "Christian Democrat principles" and "the German middle-class liberal tradition" when it comes to opposing the very real strength of unreconstructed monopoly capital in West Germany.

Another bone I have to pick with the writer is that he lists a number of very sensible "broad conditions for a stable settlement" without mentioning that practically all these points have in fact been raised, not once but repeatedly, by the Government of the German Democratic Republic. In many scores of approaches to the West German Government, and to West German Social Democrats, just these points have been made, and have been flatly turned down.

But let us leave aside these, and a number of other criticisms that I could make, and get down to the point which made me sit back and wonder. The writer of the "New Statesman" article notes that "only the symptoms discreditable to Dr Adenauer's regime" are mentioned in the East German press. This is not completely true, and I must say I find it hard to think of any symptoms creditable to the Adenauer regime, with its big-business backing and its call for the atom-bomb-arming of the new West German Wehrmacht, but there is a certain grain of truth in it. Regular readers of the East German press — and for readers of the present lines this means mainly GERMAN REPORT — may sometimes get the impression that West Germany is almost entirely populated with neo-fascists, Hitlerite generals, and arms kings like Krupp. Luckily, of course, this impression is not true.

The fact that it is not true is vividly shown up every now and then: the most striking recent instance has been the action of the eighteen West German atom scientists, fully reported in our issue of April 26th in protesting very strongly against the atomic arming of the Wehrmacht. Their protest, and the support which they immediately received from considerable sections of the press and the public, including the six-million-strong West German trade union movement, showed the whole world that on the question of atomic warfare, at any rate, Adenauer and his Hitlerite generals did not have the West German public behind them.

Our lesson from all this? We promise to keep on bashing away at the neo-nazis, the cannon-kings and the financiers in West Germany, as in the past: this is an important job, and one which is quite naturally almost entirely neglected by the big-business press in the western world. But at the same time we shall endeavour to give a more balanced picture by showing what is being done in all sorts of circles in West Germany — not just by the Communist Party, now driven underground, and by progressive elements in the labour movement, but also by many liberals — to oppose the steady pressure towards a new totalitarianism and war.

And we shall continue, of course, to bring you the fullest reports available in English of developments in the German Democratic Republic.

Edited and published fortnightly by John Peet Democratic German Report, Friedrichstrasse 167/III Berlin W 8, Telephone 22 29 68. Printed in Germany by (36). Veröffentlicht unter Lizenz-Nr. 694 beim Presseamt des Ministerpräsidenten der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik